

<i>Interview Summary</i>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/691,316	WARE ET AL.
	Examiner Rodney B. White	Art Unit 3636

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Rodney B. White. (3) _____.

(2) Douglas L. Wathen (#41,369). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 27 July 2004.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 14, 26, 34, and 37-43.

Identification of prior art discussed: Barile (U.S. Patent No. 6,406,096).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Rodney B. White
Patent Examiner

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed the subject matter, or more specifically, the "corner piece" in claim 37. Examiner expressed to Applicant's Representative that the claim was very broad and that the prior art of record as well as additional references found while updating the search still read 102(b) or 102(e) on the claim(s). Claims 37-43 simply were not allowable over the prior art. The Examiner's Amendment was agreed upon and entered as such to expedite prosecution of the application.